



ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVE MARKET LINKAGES IN PROMOTING INVESTMENTS IN NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN THE RICE-BASED FARMING SYSTEM IN MALAWI: A CASE OF NKHATE IRRIGATION SCHEME

Ruth Magreta, Shamie Zingore, Tennyson Magombo

► To cite this version:

Ruth Magreta, Shamie Zingore, Tennyson Magombo. ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVE MARKET LINKAGES IN PROMOTING INVESTMENTS IN NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN THE RICE-BASED FARMING SYSTEM IN MALAWI: A CASE OF NKHATE IRRIGATION SCHEME. ISDA 2010, Jun 2010, Montpellier, France. 12 p. hal-00523464

HAL Id: hal-00523464

<https://hal.science/hal-00523464>

Submitted on 5 Oct 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVE MARKET LINKAGES IN PROMOTING INVESTMENTS IN NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN THE RICE-BASED FARMING SYSTEM IN MALAWI: A CASE OF NKHATE IRRIGATION SCHEME

Ruth Magreta ^{12*}, Shamie Zingore¹, Tennyson Magombo²

¹International Centre for Tropical Agriculture, Chitedze Research Station,
P.O Box 158, Lilongwe, Malawi

²University of Malawi, Bunda College of Agriculture, P.O Box 219, Lilongwe, Malawi.

Abstract

This study focuses on assessing how effective market linkages have promoted investments in natural resource management in the smallholder rice-based farming systems in Nkhate Irrigation Scheme, in the context of the Enabling Rural Livelihoods approach. As both income and investment in natural resource management is linked to the wealth status of the farmers, a participatory wealth ranking exercise was done to group farmers into resource groups. Farmers were grouped into three resource-endowment classes; high resource-endowment (RG 1), intermediate (RG 2) and resource-constrained (RG 3), on the basis of cattle ownership, use of mineral fertilizers and land ownership. The study used household data on these resource groups to address two specific objectives in influence of enhanced farmer market linkages: (i) to assess the profitability of rice (ii) to assess farmer decisions on allocation of income from rice to natural resource management. The results indicate that from the participatory gross margin analysis which was done by CIAT (2007) with rice farmers at the irrigation scheme, it was revealed that farmers have been making losses in the marketing of Kirombero and Super Fire rice varieties and have been realizing a very small positive margin for Mtupatupa a local rice variety. The analysis revealed gross margins of 36.78 US\$ ha⁻¹, -182.50 US\$ ha⁻¹, and 60.36 US\$ ha⁻¹, for Super fire, Kirombero and Mtupatupa varieties respectively. However, after farmers were effectively linked to markets, farmers realized gross margins of 681.84US\$ ha⁻¹, 664.23US\$ ha⁻¹ and 1,028.69US\$ ha⁻¹ for Mtupatupa, Super fire and Kirombero rice varieties respectively. The results further showed that a lot of investment from money gotten from rice sales has gone into improving food security and the accumulation of household assets as well as improving the dwelling houses. This was regardless of farmer's wealth status.

Key words: Enabling Rural Innovation, Profitability, Natural resource management, smallholder farmers, wealth ranking



INTRODUCTION

Malawi depends largely on agriculture for economic development however it is challenged by three critical issues, in the face of declining agricultural productivity. Firstly, the need to keep pace with the growing demand for food; secondly, the need to ensure cash crop production for foreign exchange; and finally how to achieve these core objectives while ensuring that soil fertility is properly managed. Both the government and agricultural research and development organizations have been developing different technologies with an aim of achieving the stated objectives. Most of the developed technologies have been slow in their adoption and utilization by smallholder farmers. This has been so because they only targeted increase in yields for food security without considering improving profitability, competitiveness and sustainability of agricultural production (Mvula, Chirwa & Kadzamira, 2003).

In an attempt to put farmers first, the use of participatory learning approaches has been a focal point in building capacity of farmers themselves to understand markets, to identify challenges and opportunities and deal with them using participatory research that draws on new information and indigenous knowledge. In the same line, the International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) in Africa has since 2006 been piloting an intervention strategy known as Enabling Rural Innovation (ERI) in Nkhate Rice Irrigation scheme in Malawi. ERI is a mutual and collective learning process that aims at empowering rural communities by strengthening their social organization and entrepreneurial skills, encouraging them to produce what they can market rather than market what they produce. It also aims at enhancing community's ability to conduct research that links technology development to market opportunities and to improved management of natural resources for sustainable rural livelihoods. The main components of the approach are; Participatory Market Research (PMR); Farmer Participatory Research (FPR); Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E).

Irrigation agriculture is being promoted in Malawi not only as a way of fostering rural development, but also as a means of reducing rural poverty, malnutrition, diseases and the growing social and economic inequalities between the rural and the urban areas. Nkhate irrigation scheme is one of the irrigation schemes that are under rehabilitation for hand over to the smallholder farmers. It consists of 1165 members who cultivate different crops throughout the year using canal irrigation with water from Nkhate River. Rice and maize are the main crops grown throughout the year both as summer and as winter crops. Rice is the dominating crop taking more than 75% of the irrigation scheme during summer season. Despite its greatest role in food security and income generation its production and marketing has not been impressive. To sustain high productivity in the irrigation schemes, sound soil fertility management, including use of fertilizer is required.

A major factor discouraging investments in fertilizer are low rice prices as a result of poor markets. In agreement with the above, results from a participatory diagnosis conducted in the area in 2007 revealed that marketing of rice was a major problem for the smallholder



farmers in the area. Growing evidence and experience indicates that sustaining success in productivity-based agricultural growth critically depends on expansion of market opportunities (Diano & Hezel 2004) and requires thinking beyond productivity to incorporate profitability and competitiveness (Kaplinsky, 2004). Rice being the dominant crop in the area, efforts of improving its production while maintaining soil fertility relies mostly on the income realized from agricultural sales.

Among the major cereals, rice is the most rapidly growing food source on the continent. Between 1961 and 2005, the annual increase on rice consumption was 4.52% in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA)-mostly faster than rice production growth during the same period. In 2006 the total quantity of milled rice consumed in SSA was 14.7 million tons. During 2001-2005, rice consumption in SSA grew at 5.84% per year. This positive development in rice consumption can be largely attributed to strong demand in southern and west Africa, where rice consumption grew (on average) at 11.58% and 6.55% per year, respectively. Average per-capita rice consumption in SSA was 18kg per year in 2001-2005 (WARDA, 2007).

In Malawi, rice production is not enough to meet national demand and as a result, Malawi depends on imports to meet the shortfall. The imported rice is mainly sold and consumed in urban centres. In 2002 rice production was about two-thirds of the national demand (FEWSNET, 2006). During the period 2001 - 2005 the average milled rice production in Malawi was 49,990 MT. Growth rates for yield, harvest area and production were -11.79%, -5.88% and -16.97% respectively. But the growth rate for rice consumption was 8.53%. In this period, Malawi had a rice self sufficient ratio of 0.97 and rice imports represented 3% of the total quantity consumed (WARDA, 2007).

Low income levels from rice are the major problem for rice smallholder farmers in Southern Malawi, Nkhate Irrigation Scheme in particular. (CIAT, 2007). The major cause of this problem has been lack of farmers' linkage to better or profitable rice market outlets as well as lack of farmers' intelligence in timing their rice sales (Kohls & Uhl, 1980). Most farmers have not been able to take advantage of the rising seasonal rice prices as a result most of them in Nkhate have been selling their rice in the period of May - July, soon after harvest and the prices have been low during this period as compared to the periods August - September and October - December. Farmers have been accepting to sell their rice at very low dictated prices because they have been so desperate for money to meet their basic needs after investing in their rice fields.

This is a serious problem for farmers in the area because rice production is their main livelihood strategy and low income levels mean inability of farmers to actively participate in the day to day economic activities. Low income levels can also be translated into lack of access to basic needs of life that require to be purchased with money. This paper analyses the rice gross margins for smallholder farmers in Southern Malawi, Nkhate Irrigation Scheme in particular at different farming seasons and provides policy interventions that can assist



farmers to take advantage of the existing market outlets in order to realize more profits from their rice agro enterprise and hence invest back into the soils.

Using farmer participatory research the farmers were trained and linked to reliable markets. A participatory gross margin analysis was then conducted for 2007 and 2008 growing season. A follow up income tracking study was conducted to assess influence of enhanced farmer – market linkages on farmer decisions on allocation of the income from rice. This study therefore provides results of the gross margin analysis and results of the income tracking exercise.

1.0 REVIEW OF RICE SMALLHOLDER FARMERS' PROFITABILITY AT NKHATE IRRIGATION SCHEME

From the participatory gross margin analysis which was done by CIAT (2007) with rice farmers at the irrigation scheme, it was revealed that indeed farmers have been making losses in the marketing of Kirombero and Super fire rice varieties and have been realizing a very small positive margin for Mtupatupa -a local rice variety. The analysis revealed gross margins of -136.78 US\$ ha⁻¹, -182.50 US\$ ha⁻¹, and 60.36 US\$ ha⁻¹, for Super fire, Kirombero and Mtupatupa varieties respectively. The analysis also showed the break even prices of 0.15 US\$ kg⁻¹, 0.18 US\$ kg⁻¹ and 0.22 US\$ kg⁻¹ for Mtupatupa, Super fire and Kirombero rice varieties respectively. Traditionally, the average price that traders have been offering at least for the past three seasons has been 0.16 US\$ kg⁻¹ for Mtupatupa and 0.18 US\$ kg⁻¹ for Super fire and Kirombero rice varieties. Thus it is so clear that farmers have been making losses and it's assumed that traders have just been making money at the expense of farmers sweat and toil in the rice fields (CIAT, 2007). These low gross margins have mainly been due to lack of linkage of rice farmers to profitable market outlets.

1.1 Methodology

1.1.1 Study Area

Nkhate irrigation scheme (134° 56' E and latitude 16° 9' S) is one of the schemes in Livunzu Extension Planning area situated 50 Km east of Chikwawa District. It has distinct winter (May–September) and summer seasons (October–April) and the annual rainfall is less than 800 mm distributed primarily between November and May, its temperatures range from 20–41 degrees Celsius. The topography is fairly flat, with slopes around 0 – 2%. Farmers in the area are researching on different ways of managing their wetlands so as to improve the ecological sustainability of their farms and ultimately their economic viability. These farmers are in two categories one group cultivates in the irrigation scheme and the other outside the scheme. The irrigation scheme consists of 1165 members who cultivate different crops throughout the year using canal irrigation with water from Nkhate River. Of the members only 6% are women (75) and the scheme also consists of a few young farmers (under 18 years of age) that have inherited the membership from a deceased parent. The irrigation Scheme has a gross area of 243 hectares. Farmers inside the scheme cultivate 2- 3 times a year unlike those outside the scheme who mostly manages to cultivate once a year. Those farming in the scheme have an average land holding size of 0.2 hectares whilst those outside the scheme have an average of 0.4 hectares.



1.1.2 Sampling Design

As both income and investment in natural resource management is linked to the wealth status of the farmers, a participatory wealth ranking exercise was done to group farmers into resource groups. Different indicators of wealth status were developed during a focus group involving farmers in the scheme and those from the surrounding communities. The table below is showing the household typologies that were identified by the farmers.

Table 1: Household Characteristics and Typology for Farmers at Nkhate Irrigation Scheme

| Indicators of Wealth Status of the Farmers and the Characteristics of the Different Groups | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Indicators of Wealth Status and other Characteristics | Resource Group1 (High Resource Endowment) | Resource Group 2 (Intermediate resource Endowment) | Resource Group 3 (Resource Constrained) |
| farm Size | farm size about 0.4ha | farm size about 0.2ha | farm size about 0.1ha |
| Livestock Ownership | owns 10-40 cattle | owns <10 cattle and few livestock | No livestock |
| Farming Implements | Own Scotch cart and all farm implements | Own all implements but rarely scotch cart | Own only small implements such as hoes |
| Draught Power | Own oxen for draught power | Own oxen for draught power | no draught power |
| Hire or Sell Labour | Afford hiring labour | Hire labour occasionally | Sell labour all times |
| Mineral Fertiliser | buy fertiliser every season | buy fertiliser occasionally | do not buy fertiliser |
| Asset Ownership | Own grinding mill, runs small businesses | runs smaller businesses | do not have grinding mill neither a business |
| Food Security | Have food the whole year round | Have food the whole year round | run out of food before the year ends |

Source (Own Survey 2007)

1.1.3 Conceptual Framework and Theoretical Review

Consider a smallholder farmer who has a bundle of scarce resources to be utilized in the production of rice. Assume that this farmer is rational and would like to maximize profits. Given options in terms of rice value chains this farmer will obviously go for a most profitable value chain because he/she is rational.

Assuming that the farmer has inputs L (Labor) and K (Capital), and using these inputs a farmer wants to produce output Y.

Let L_y denotes amount of Labor required to produce output Y.

K_y denotes amount of capital required to produce output Y.



Mathematically this scenario can be represented as below:

$$\text{Max } Y = f(L_y, K_y)$$

$$\text{Subject to : } X = g(L_y, K_y)$$

Where X denotes an input combination of L and K that would maximize output Y.

By solving this maximization problem, using a Lagrange method, the farmer can identify an efficient level of production of Y. This optimal level of Y can be denoted as Y^* . Then Y^* is produced using optimal input levels L_y^* and K_y^* .

But since we are looking at the farmer whose main objective is to maximize profit, then we introduce other variables namely, price of output and cost of inputs.

Let p denotes price of output. (US\$)

w denotes cost of inputs (US\$).

R denotes total revenue from sale of output (US\$) i.e $p(y)$.

C denotes total cost of variable inputs (US\$).

Therefore the farmer's problem would be to maximize the gross margin (Z) i.e $R-C$ and it can mathematically be presented as follows:

$$\text{Max } Z = p(Y^*) - w_i(X^*) \quad \forall \quad i = L, K$$

$$\text{where : } Y^* = f(L_y^*, K_y^*)$$

$$X^* = g(L_y^*, K_y^*)$$

Given an opportunity to produce one crop, say, rice a farmer will always think of how to increase his/her gross margin from rice. One way a farmer can increase rice gross margin is through value addition. There are several stages of value addition and these stages form what is being referred to as a value chain. Each stage of the value chain has functions that a farmer or an agent needs to perform in order to add value to the produce. These functions attract costs and of course add value to the product. At the farm stage of the value chain a farmer can add value to rice by storage and sell at a period when the prices are reasonably higher.

1.1.4 Gross Margin Analysis

At the production level of the value chain, gross margin analysis is very key in analyzing the costs that goes into a product and hence profitability of an enterprise. The gross margin that a farmer gets is being affected by the costs of production, marketing costs, output level and the selling price which depends on the value chain actor to which the farmer is connected to as a produce market outlet. Prices are also affected by the degree of competition of the rice market, the period the farmer decides to sell rice and other price stabilization policies influenced by the Government. Gross margin



of an activity is defined as gross output (Price *times* yield) less all variable or direct costs. (Hazell, 1971). Kay et al (2004) defined gross margin as a difference between income and variable costs. Gross margin can be used as a proxy of profitability of an enterprise or value chain.

At the farm gate the gross margins were calculated by use of farm gate prices for both inputs and outputs. To calculate gross margins the following formula was used:

$$GM = GI - VC$$

Where,

GM Is the gross margin per unit land

GI is the gross income which was calculated as the product of price per unit of output at farm gate and the amount of units harvested per unit of land; and

VC Is the variable cost directly linked to production and Post harvest handling

2.0 DATA

The data used for analysis in this study were based on a farm household survey administered to a sample of 150 farm families stratified by wealth status. These farm families were randomly drawn from those that have plots in the irrigation scheme and participated in the wealth ranking exercise. From these farmers, rice technology information related to variety grown, rate of input application, yield levels, output price and input prices were collected and used in the analysis. To analyze the profitability of rice gross margin analysis was done on the three main varieties grown in the area.

The variables that were considered in the calculation of the total variable cost were, cost of fertilizer, cost of seed, irrigation cost, labor cost and marketing costs. The average yield levels, average total variable costs and the average output price for each period were calculated using STATA 10 statistical package and were used in the calculation of gross margins for each rice variety in an Excel computer package. The descriptive statistics for all the variables that were used in the calculations of the rice gross margins are presented in Table 2.



Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Superfire, Mtupatupa and Kilombero Rice Varieties

| Variable | Description | Mean | Std Deviation |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------------|
| yield | Superfire rice yield (kgs ha ⁻¹) | 4,340.73 | 1,396.22 |
| | Mtupatupa rice yield (kgs ha ⁻¹) | 5,259.26 | 1,884.25 |
| | Kilombero rice yield (kgs ha ⁻¹) | 3,845.00 | 1,217.59 |
| TVC | Total variable costs for Superfire rice (US\$ha ⁻¹) | 1,084.86 | 191.55 |
| | Total variable costs for Mtupatupa rice (US\$ha ⁻¹) | 1,100.94 | 173.15 |
| | Total variable costs for Kilombero rice (US\$ha ⁻¹) | 1,069.60 | 225.21 |
| Price | Output price for Superfire rice (US\$kg ⁻¹) | 0.42 | 0.04 |
| | Output price for Mtupatupa rice (US\$kg ⁻¹) | 0.40 | 0.04 |
| | Output price for Kilombero rice (US\$kg ⁻¹) | 0.45 | 0.04 |

Source (Own survey 2008)

3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1 Gross Margin Analysis

The calculated gross margins are shown in table 3. From these two it can be seen that farmer's gross margins have increased from the base year (2007) to the second year (2008). From this it vivid that farmers can get higher prices if effectively linked to market outlets of rice.

Table 3: Mean Farmers Gross Margins¹ for Each Rice Variety by Cropping Season Category

| Cropping Season | Superfire | Mtupatupa | Kilombero |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 2006-2007 | -136.78 | 60.36 | -182.50 |
| 2007-2008 | 681.84 | 1,028.69 | 665.23 |

Source (Own survey 2007 and 2008)


¹ These gross margins were calculated in US\$ ha⁻¹, the exchange rate used was MK140 against 1US\$ in both cropping seasons



3.2 Farmer Investments Decisions with Increasing Market Linkages

There have been drastic cut backs in investment in natural resources by smallholder farmers in the area. The results show that a lot of investment from money realized from rice sales is being invested in accumulation of household assets, improving food security as well as improving living conditions such as construction of better houses see figure 1.

Figure 1: Household Investments² from Linkages to Markets




Source (Own Survey 2008)

The above trend did not differ with wealth status of a farmer; figure 2 shows household investments by wealth category with priority in accumulation of household assets, food security and thirdly natural resource management which is mainly soil fertility management.

² These investment figures were calculated in US\$ ha⁻¹, the exchange rate used was MK140 against 1US\$



Figure 2: Household Investments³ from Linkages to Markets by Wealth Category



Source (Own survey 2008)

This trend is so because of the seasonal farming that happens at the irrigation scheme. Rice is harvested and sold in the months of May to December and during this time farmers are involved in winter cropping. Majority of the farmers in the area do not apply inorganic fertilizer to their winter crop they however rely of residual effects of fertilizer applied in rice during summer cropping. The winter crops are normally harvested and sold between November and January. It was established that they use the money sourced to buy fertilizer and seed for the rice.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The study clearly shows that rice gross margins were have increased after increasing market linkages in the two cropping seasons. In terms of policy implications, sustainability in maintaining the market linkages as well as in improving the capacity of farmers in conducting market research is key and essential for increasing farmers' income hence improved livelihoods especially at Nkhate Irrigation Scheme where rice agro enterprise is their main livelihood strategy. Thus there is need for policy interventions to promote effective farmer market linkages in order to sustain the already realized markets.

Furthermore, it is clear that income realized from rice sales is not going to NRM most of it is going in improving living standards of people. The study has however, showed that there is potential that most of the money realized from sales of winter crops is reinvested in NRM. In both cases farmers are using the marketing knowledge they acquired during the PMR. The use of participatory approaches to identify market opportunities and enterprise selection rather than prescribing markets and products is especially critical for empowering farmers and creating ownership of the process in rural communities.

³ These investment figures were calculated in US\$ ha⁻¹, the exchange rate used was MK140 against 1US\$



However, it is important to note that the scope for rice storage to increase farmers' incomes depends on consistent integration of good government's price stabilization policies, strong farmers' organization and access to good storage facilities. Thus establishment of strong farmers' organizations in the smallholder farming systems can provide a mechanism for which smallholder farmers can collectively store their rice and sell when the prices are higher. The farmers' organizations can provide what is being referred to as a commodity warranty to the farmers through a commodity warranty scheme which can be put in Place. With this farmers can be able to buy enough fertilizer and other farm inputs which can be used to increase production levels of their winter crops.

REFERENCES

CIAT (2007). Participatory Diagnosis at Nkhate Irrigation Scheme. May 2007.

CIAT (2007). Participatory Value Chain Analysis for Rice at Nkhate Irrigation Scheme.

Diao, X and Hezell, P. (2004). Exploring Market Opportunities for African Smallholders. Paper prepared for 2020 Africa conference "Assuring Food Security in Africa by 2020; Prioritizing Actions, Strengthening Actors, and Facilitating Partnerships. Kampala, Uganda. April 1-3, 2004

FEWS-Net (2006) Malawi Food Security Status

Hazell, P.B.R. (1971). A Linear Alternative to Quadratic and Semi variance Programming for Farm Planning under Uncertainty. American Journal of Agricultural Economics.53:53-62. February, 1971.

Kaplinsky, R. (2000). A handbook for Value Chain Analysis. Ottawa, Canada. International Development Research Centre.

Kay, R.D., Edwards, W.M. and Duffy, P.A. (2004). Farm Management. 5th Ed. Mc. Graw - Hill. USA.

Kohls, R.L and Uhl, J.N. (1980). Marketing of Agricultural Products. 5th Edition Maxwell, Macmillan International Editions, New York.



Montpellier – France
28 June – 1st July 2010

Innovation and Sustainable Development in Agriculture and Food

www.isda2010.net



Mvula, P.M., Chirwa. E.W, and Kadzandira (2003) Poverty and Social Impact Assessment in Malawi: Closure of ADMARC Markets. Wadonda Consult, (Social Development Department, The World Bank, USA.

WARDA (Africa Rice Centre). (2007). Africa Rice Trends, City of publication and publishers.